

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 9-20 are pending and rejected in the above-identified application.

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-14, 18, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Furlong* (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0123824) and *Ali* (U.S. Patent No. 6,549,818). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As the Examiner admits in the Office Action, *Furlong* does not teach "storing the plurality of recipe programs in a user profile at a remote location remote from the intelligent appliance," as required by claims 1, 10, 18, and 20. However, the Examiner then argues that *Ali* may be combined with *Furlong* to teach this limitation. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Ali does not disclose or even suggest "storing the plurality of recipe programs in a user profile at a remote location remote from the intelligent appliance." In fact, contrary to the Examiner's contentions, *Ali* actually teaches away from the present invention. *Ali* teaches an appliance that may have multiple user profiles stored in a memory in the appliance so that cooking instructions can be altered depending on the person using the appliance. Although *Ali* envisions that the appliance can be connected to the internet, it specifically teaches only that the user profile is stored in the memory of the appliance. Thus, *Ali* not only does not disclose the invention in claims 1, 10, 18 and 20, but teaches away from it.

Additionally, while the Examiner contends that two of the methods taught in *Ali* use a remote user profile, a closer reading indicates that this is not the case. On column 5, line 5, *Ali* teaches that the program 26 (located in the appliance) inputs a user profile and the program modifies the cooking recipe. While *Ali* states that the cooking recipe may be downloaded from the internet, the user profile is described as being located only in the memory of the appliance.

Similarly, on column 5, line 8, *Ali* described another embodiment where the user profile may be sent from the appliance to the host computer where the recipe is modified before downloading. Again, while a connection to the internet is envisioned, *Ali* specifically teaches that the user profile is saved and kept in the memory of the appliance. Although this user profile may be sent to a host computer, *Ali* does not teach or even suggest that this user profile be saved in the host computer, but simply that it is used to modify the a recipe program being downloaded.

As discussed in Applicant's Response to the May 27, 2004 Office Action, storing the user profile in a remote location as recited by claims 1, 10, 18, and 20 allows numerous advantages such as maintaining a central database of recipes for any intelligent appliances in a household, allowing for automatic updates of the recipes in the user profile, or creating requests in the user profile for new recipes that are not presently available. As the cited references do not disclose "storing the plurality of recipe programs in a user profile in a location remote from the intelligent appliance", Applicant submits that independent Claims 1, 10, 18, and 20 as well as dependent Claims 2-6 and 11-17 are in condition for allowance.

With regards to claim 7, Applicant submits that the cited art does not teach either "an appliance identifier element linked to the user identifier element" or "a plurality of recipe program elements linked to the appliance identifier element." As in the previous Office Action, the Examiner simply points to the appliance itself as disclosing the appliance identifier element (although in this office action the Examiner points to the appliance in *Ali* rather than the appliance in *Furlong*). However, the mere presence of an appliance does not disclose or even suggest the use of an appliance identifier element. First, as there are not multiple appliances in either *Furlong* or *Ali* connecting to one database, there is simply no teaching to associate any

recipe programs in the database based on the type appliance. Moreover, because the cited references teach only a single appliance that can connect to the relevant database, there is no need to identify the appliance. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 7, as well as dependent claim 9, is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner continues to maintain this objection, Applicant requests that the Examiner identify specifically where the cited art discloses either an appliance identifier element or recipe programs linked to the appliance identifier element

Finally, Claims 16, 17, and 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Furlong* and *Ali* and further in view of *Krichilsky*. As claims 16 and 17 depend from claim 1, they are allowable for the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Similarly, claims 19 recites a "user profile in a location remote from an intelligent appliance," Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 19 is also allowable for the same reasons as discussed above for claims 1, 10, 18, and 20.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 13, 2005

By: 

David Rozenblat
Registration No. 47,044
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000